arXiv:1510.02746v1 [quant-ph] 9 Oct 2015

The Phase Space Formulation of Time-Symmetric Quantum Mechanics, I: the Wigner Formalism

Charlyne de Gosson and Maurice de Gosson
University of Vienna, NuHAG Faculty of Mathematics
Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna AUSTRIA

October 12, 2015

Abstract

Time-symmetric quantum mechanics can be described in the usual Weyl–Wigner–Moyal formalism (WWM) by using the properties of the Wigner distribution, and its generalization, the cross-Wigner distribution. The use of the latter makes clear a strongly oscillating interference between the pre- and post-selected states. This approach allows us to give explicit formulas for the state reconstruction problem, thus generalizing known results to the case of arbitrary observables. In a forthcoming paper we will extend these results to other quantization schemes.

1 Introduction and Description of the Problem

We will work with systems having n degrees of freedom. Position (resp. momentum) variables are denoted $x = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ (resp. $p = (p_1, ..., p_n)$). The corresponding phase space variable is (x, p). The scalar product $p_1x_1 + \cdots + p_nx_n$ is denoted by px. When integrating we will use, where appropriate, the volume elements $d^nx = dx_1 \cdots dx_n$, $d^np = dp_1 \cdots dp_n$. The unitary $\hbar$-Fourier transform of a square-integrable function Ψ of x is

$$\widehat{\Psi}(p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^{n/2} \int e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}px}\Psi(x)d^nx. \tag{1}$$

We denote by $\widehat{x} = (\widehat{x}_1, ..., \widehat{x}_n)$ and $\widehat{p} = (\widehat{p}_1, ..., \widehat{p}_n)$ the (vector) operators defined by $\widehat{x}_j\Psi = x_j\Psi$, $\widehat{p}_j\Psi = -i\hbar\partial_{x_j}\Psi$.

1.1 The notion of weak value

In time-symmetric quantum mechanics (TSQM) the state of a system is represented by a two-state vector $\langle\Phi|\,|\Psi\rangle$ where the state $\langle\Phi|$ evolves backwards from the future and the state $|\Psi\rangle$ evolves forwards from the past. To make things clear, assume that at a time $t_{\rm i}$ an observable $\widehat{A}$ is measured and a non-degenerate eigenvalue was found: $|\Psi(t_{\rm i})\rangle = |\widehat{A} = \alpha\rangle$; similarly at a later time $t_{\rm f}$ a measurement of another observable $\widehat{B}$ yields $|\Phi(t_{\rm f})\rangle = |\widehat{B} = \beta\rangle$. Such a two-time state $\langle\Phi|\,|\Psi\rangle$ can be created as follows [1, 47]: Alice prepares a state $|\Psi(t_{\rm i})\rangle$ at initial time $t_{\rm i}$. She then sends the system to an observer, Bob, who may perform any measurement he wishes to. The system is returned to Alice, who then performs a, strong measurement with the state $|\Phi(t_{\rm f})\rangle$ as one of the outcomes. Only if this outcome is obtained, does Bob keep the results of his measurement.

Let now t be some intermediate time: $t_{\rm i} < t < t_{\rm f}$. Following the time-symmetric approach to quantum mechanics at this intermediate time the system is described by the *two* wavefunctions

$$\Psi = U_{\rm i}(t, t_{\rm i})\Psi(t_{\rm i}) \quad , \quad \Phi = U_{\rm f}(t, t_{\rm f})\Phi(t_{\rm f}) \tag{2}$$

where $U_{\rm i}(t, t') = e^{-i\widehat{H_{\rm i}}(t-t')/\hbar}$ and $U_{\rm f}(t, t') = e^{-i\widehat{H_{\rm f}}(t-t')/\hbar}$ are the unitary operators governing the evolution of the state before and after time t. Consider now the superposition of the two states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ (which we suppose normalized); the expectation value

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi+\Phi} = \langle\Psi + \Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi + \Phi\rangle$$

of the observable $\widehat{A}$ in this superposition is obtained using the equality

$$||\Phi + \Psi||\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi+\Phi} = \langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi} + \langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi} + 2\,{\rm Re}\langle\Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle; \tag{3}$$

setting $N = ||\Phi + \Psi||$ we get, assuming $\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle \neq 0$,

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi+\Phi} = \frac{1}{N}\left(\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi} + \langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi} + 2\,{\rm Re}(\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi}\right) \tag{4}$$

where

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \frac{\langle\Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle} \tag{5}$$

is, by definition, the *weak value* of $\widehat{A}$. Weak values provide an unexpected insight into a number of of fundamental quantum effects.

We will assume from now on that $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ are two normalized non-orthogonal states: $\langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle = \langle\Phi|\Phi\rangle = 1$, $\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle \neq 0$.

1.2 What we will do

In the discussion above we have been working directly in terms of the wavefunctions Ψ and Φ; now, a different kind of state description which is very fruitful, particularly in quantum optics, is provided by the Wigner distribution [49, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 33]

$$W_\Psi(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \int e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}py}\Psi(x+\tfrac{1}{2}y)\Psi^*(x-\tfrac{1}{2}y)d^ny; \tag{6}$$

the latter is directly related to the mean value $\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_\Psi = \langle\Psi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle$ by Moyal's formula [27, 41, 18, 19, 21]

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_\Psi = \iint a(x,p)W_\Psi(x,p)d^npd^nx \tag{7}$$

where $a(x,p)$ is the classical observable whose Weyl quantization is given by the Weyl–Moyal formula

$$\widehat{A} = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint \widehat{a}(x,p)e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(x\widehat{x}+p\widehat{p})}d^npd^nx \tag{8}$$

(we use the terminology classical observable" in a very broad sense; a can be any complex integrable function, or even a tempered distribution, *i.e.* an element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, dual of the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ of rapidly decreasing functions). A direct calculation shows that we have

$$W_{\Psi+\Phi} = W_\Phi + W_\Psi + 2\,\mathrm{Re}\,W_{\Psi,\Phi} \tag{9}$$

where the cross-term $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ is given by

$$W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \int e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}py}\Psi(x+\tfrac{1}{2}y)\Phi^*(x-\tfrac{1}{2}y)d^ny. \tag{10}$$

The appearance of the term $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ shows the emergence at time t of a strong interference between the preselected and the post-selected states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$. It is called the cross-Wigner distribution of Ψ,Φ, see [18, 19, 28] and the references therein. We are going to exploit the properties of $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ to give an alternative working definition of the weak value $\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi}$, namely

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \frac{1}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle}\iint a(x,p)W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)d^npd^nx \tag{11}$$

(formula (20)); here $a(x.p)$ is the classical observable whose Weyl quantization is the operator $\widehat{A}$. This allows the function

$$\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p) = \frac{W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle} \tag{12}$$

to be interpreted as a complex probability distribution. We thereafter notice that the cross-Wigner distribution can itself be seen, for fixed (x,p), as a weak value, namely that of Grossmann and Royer's parity operator $\widehat{T}_{\rm GR}(x,p)$:

$$W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) = (\pi\hbar)^n \langle \widehat{T}_{\rm GR}(x,p)\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} \langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle \tag{13}$$

(formula (36)). Using this approach we prove (formula (52)) the following reconstruction formula: if $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ is known, we can reconstruct (up to an unessential phase factor) the wave function Ψ (and hence the state $|\Psi\rangle$) using the formula

$$\Psi(x) = \frac{2^n}{\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle} \iint W_{\Psi,\Phi}(y,p)\widehat{T}_{\rm GR}(y,p)\Lambda(x) d^n p d^n y \tag{14}$$

where Λ is an arbitrary square-integrable function such that $\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle \neq 0$.

2 Weak Values in the Wigner Picture

2.1 The cross-Wigner transform

The cross-Wigner distribution is defined for all square-integrable functions Ψ, Φ; it satisfies the generalized marginal conditions

$$\int W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) d^n p = \Psi(x)\Phi^*(x) \tag{15}$$

$$\int W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) d^n x = \widehat{\Psi}(p)\widehat{\Phi}^*(p) \tag{16}$$

provided that Ψ and Φ are in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$; these formulas reduce to the usual marginal conditions for the Wigner distribution when $\Psi = \Phi$. While W_Ψ is always real (though not non-negative, unless Ψ is a Gaussian), $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ is a complex function, and we have $W^*_{\Psi,\Phi} = W_{\Phi,\Psi}$. The cross-Wigner distribution is widely used in signal theory and time-frequency analysis [18, 28]; its Fourier transform is the cross-ambiguity function familiar from radar theory [18, 52, 50]. Zurek [53] has studied $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ when $\Psi + \Phi$ is a Gaussian cat-like state, and shown that it is accountable for sub-Planck structures in phase space due to interference.

We now make the following elementary, but important remark: multiplying both sides of the equality (9) by the classical observable $a(x,p)$ and integrating with respect to the x,p variables, we get, using Moyal's formula (7),

$$||\Phi+\Psi||\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi+\Phi} = \langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi} + \langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Psi} + 2\iint a(x,p)\,\mathrm{Re}\,W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)d^npd^nx. \quad (17)$$

Comparing with formula (4) we see that

$$\mathrm{Re}\langle\Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle = \iint a(x,p)\,\mathrm{Re}\,W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)d^npd^nx. \quad (18)$$

It turns out that in the mathematical theory of the Wigner distribution [18, 19] one shows that the equality above actually holds not only for the real parts, but also for the purely imaginary parts, hence we always have

$$\langle\Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle = \iint a(x,p)W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)d^npd^nx. \quad (19)$$

An immediate consequence of this equality is that we can express the weak value $\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi}$ in terms of the cross-Wigner distribution and the classical observable $a(x,p)$ corresponding to $\widehat{A}$ in the *Weyl quantization scheme*:

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \frac{1}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle}\iint a(x,p)W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)d^npd^nx. \quad (20)$$

We emphasize that one has to be excessively careful when using formulas of the type (20) (as we will do several times in this work): the function a crucially depends on the quantization procedure which is used (here Weyl quantization); we will come back to this essential point later, but here is a simple example which shows that things can get wrong if this rule is not observed: let $\widehat{H} = \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{x}^2+\widehat{p}^2)$ be the quantization of the normalized harmonic oscillator $H(x,p) = \frac{1}{2}(x^2+p^2)$ (we assume $n=1$). While it is true that

$$\langle\widehat{H}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \frac{1}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle}\iint H(x,p)W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)dpdx \quad (21)$$

it is in contrast *not true* that

$$\langle\widehat{H}^2\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \frac{1}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle}\iint H(x,p)^2W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)dpdx. \quad (22)$$

Suppose for instance that $\Psi=\Phi$ is the ground state of the harmonic oscillator: $\widehat{H}\Psi = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\Psi$. We have $\langle\widehat{H}^2\rangle - \langle\widehat{H}\rangle^2 = 0$; however use of formula

(22) yields the wrong result $\langle \widehat{H}^2\rangle - \langle \widehat{H}\rangle^2 = \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2$. The error[1] comes from the inobservance of the prescription above: $\widehat{H}^2$ is not the Weyl quantization of $H(x,p)^2$, but that of $H(x,p)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2$ as is easily seen using the McCoy [40] rule

$$\widehat{x^r p^s} = \frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\binom{s}{k}\widehat{p}^{s-k}\widehat{x}^r\widehat{p}^k \tag{23}$$

and Born's canonical commutation relation $[\widehat{x},\widehat{p}] = i\hbar$ (see Shewell [46] for a discussion of related, examples).

2.2 A complex phase space distribution

Let us now set

$$\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p) = \frac{W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle}; \tag{24}$$

using the marginal conditions (15)–(16) we get

$$\int \rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p)d^n p = \frac{\Phi^*(x)\Psi(x)}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle} \tag{25}$$

$$\int \rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p)d^n x = \frac{\widehat{\Phi}^*(p)\widehat{\Psi}(p)}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle} \tag{26}$$

hence the function $\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}$ is a complex probability distribution:

$$\int \rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p)d^n p d^n x = 1. \tag{27}$$

The weak value is given in terms of $\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}$ by

$$\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \int a(x,p)\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p)d^n p d^n x \tag{28}$$

which reduces to the usual formula (7) in the case of an ideal measurement (*i.e.* $\Phi = \Psi$). The practical meaning of these relations is the following ([4], Chapter 13): the readings of the pointer of the measuring device will cluster around the value

$$\mathrm{Re}\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \int \mathrm{Re}(a(x,p)\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p))d^n p d^n x \tag{29}$$

[1] It is remarkable that similar errors still appear in many texts, even the best (see e.g. [12]).

while the quantity

$$\mathrm{Im}\langle\widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \int \mathrm{Im}(a(x,p)\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p))d^np d^nx \tag{30}$$

measures the shift in the variable conjugate to the pointer variable. In an interesting paper [16] Feyereisen discusses some aspects of the complex distribution $\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}$.

2.3 The cross-Wigner transform as a weak value

Let $\widehat{T}(x_0,p_0) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_0\widehat{x}-x_0\widehat{p})}$ be the Heisenberg operator; it is a unitary operator whose action on a wavefunction Ψ is given by

$$\widehat{T}(x_0,p_0)\Psi(x) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_0x-\frac{1}{2}p_0x_0)}\Psi(x-x_0). \tag{31}$$

It has the following simple dynamical interpretation [19, 33]: $\widehat{T}(z_0)$ is the time-one propagator for the Schrödinger equation corresponding to the translation Hamiltonian $H_0 = x_0p-p_0x$. An associated operator is the Grossmann–Royer reflection operator (or displacement parity operator) [19, 25, 45]:

$$\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(x_0,p_0) = \widehat{T}(x_0,p_0)R^\vee\widehat{T}(x_0,p_0)^\dagger \tag{32}$$

where $R^\vee$ changes the parity of the function to which it is applied: $R^\vee\Psi(x) = \Psi(-x)$; the explicit action of $\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(z_0)$ on wavefunctions is easily obtained using formula (31) and one finds

$$\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(x_0,p_0)\Psi(x) = e^{\frac{2i}{\hbar}p_0(x-x_0)}\Psi(2x_0-x). \tag{33}$$

Now, a straightforward calculation shows that the Wigner distribution W_Ψ is (up to an unessential factor), the expectation value of $\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(x_0,p_0)$ in the state $|\Psi\rangle$; in fact (dropping the subscripts 0)

$$W_\Psi(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{\pi\hbar}\right)^n\langle\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(x,p)\Psi|\Psi\rangle. \tag{34}$$

More generally, a similar calculation shows that the cross-Wigner transform is given by

$$W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{\pi\hbar}\right)^n\langle\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(x,p)\Phi|\Psi\rangle \tag{35}$$

and can hence be viewed as a transition amplitude. Taking (5) into account we thus have

$$W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) = (\pi\hbar)^n\langle\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{GR}}(x,p)\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi}\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle; \tag{36}$$

this relation immediately implies, using definition (24) of the complex probability distribution $\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}$, the important equality

$$\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p) = (\pi\hbar)^n \langle \widehat{T}_{\rm GR}(x,p)\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} \tag{37}$$

which can in principle be used to determine $\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}$.

As already mentioned, the cross-ambiguity function $A_{\Psi,\Phi}$ is essentially the Fourier transform of $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$; in fact

$$A_{\Psi,\Phi} = \mathcal{F}_\sigma W_{\Psi,\Phi} \quad , \quad W_{\Psi,\Phi} = \mathcal{F}_\sigma A_{\Psi,\Phi} \tag{38}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_\sigma$ is the symplectic Fourier transform: if $a = a(x,p)$ then $\mathcal{F}_\sigma a(x,p) = \widehat{a}(p,-x)$ where $\widehat{a}$ is the ordinary $2n$-dimensional $\hbar$-Fourier transform of a; explicitly

$$\mathcal{F}_\sigma a(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(xp'-p'x)} a(x',p') d^n p' d^n x'. \tag{39}$$

Both equalities in (38) are equivalent because the symplectic Fourier transform is involutive, and hence its own inverse. While the cross-Wigner distribution is a measure of *interference*, the cross-ambiguity function is rather a measure of *correlation*. One shows [18, 19, 21, 28] that $A_{\Psi,\Phi}$ is explicitly given by

$$A_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \int e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}py} \Psi(y+\tfrac{1}{2}x)\Phi^*(y-\tfrac{1}{2}x) d^n y. \tag{40}$$

The cross-ambiguity function is easily expressed using the Heisenberg operator instead of the Grossmann–Royer operator: we have

$$A_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \langle \widehat{T}(x,p)\Phi|\Psi\rangle. \tag{41}$$

The following important result shows that the knowledge of the classical observable a allows us to determine the weak value of the corresponding Weyl operator using the weak value of the Grossmann–Royer (resp. the Heisenberg) operator:

Proposition 1 *Let $\widehat{A}$ be the Weyl quantization of the classical observable a. We have*

$$\langle \widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \left(\tfrac{1}{\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint a(x,p) \langle \widehat{T}_{GR}(x,p)\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} d^n p d^n x \tag{42}$$

and

$$\langle \widehat{A}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint \mathcal{F}_\sigma a(x,p) \langle \widehat{T}(x,p)\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} d^n p d^n x. \tag{43}$$

Proof. In view of Moyal's formula (19) we have

$$\langle \Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle = \iint a(x,p)W_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)d^npd^nx \tag{44}$$

that is, taking (35) into account

$$\langle \Phi|\widehat{A}|\Psi\rangle = \left(\tfrac{1}{\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint a(x,p)\langle \widehat{T}_{\rm GR}(x,p)\Phi|\Psi\rangle d^npd^nx \tag{45}$$

hence (42); formula (43) is obtained in a similar way, first applying the Plancherel formula to the right-hand side of (44), then applying the first identity (38), and finally using (41). ■

Notice that the formulas above immediately yield the well-known [18, 19, 21, 33] representations of the operator $\widehat{A}$ in terms of the Grossmann–Royer and Heisenberg operators:

$$\widehat{A} = \left(\tfrac{1}{\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint a(x,p)\widehat{T}_{\rm GR}(x,p)d^npd^nx \tag{46}$$

and

$$\widehat{A} = \left(\tfrac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^n \iint \mathcal{F}_\sigma a(x,p)\widehat{T}(x,p)d^npd^nx. \tag{47}$$

3 The Reconstruction Problem

3.1 Lundeen's experiment

In 2012 Lundeen and his co-workers [35] determined the wavefunction by weakly measuring the position, and thereafter performing a strong measurement of the momentum. They considered the following experiment on a particle: a weak measurement of x is performed which amounts to applying the projection operator $\widehat{\Pi}_x = |x\rangle\langle x|$ to the pre-selected state $|\Psi\rangle$; thereafter they perform a strong measurement of momentum, which yields the value p_0. The result of the weak measurement is thus

$$\langle \widehat{\Pi}_x\rangle^{\Psi,\Phi} = \frac{\langle p_0|x\rangle\langle x|\Psi\rangle}{\langle p_0|\Psi\rangle} = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\right)^{n/2}\frac{e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}p_0x}\Psi(x)}{\widehat{\Psi}(p_0)} \tag{48}$$

($\widehat{\Psi}$ the Fourier transform of Ψ). Since the value of p_0 is known we get

$$\Psi(x) = \frac{1}{k}e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}p_0x}\langle \widehat{\Pi}_x\rangle^{\Psi,\Phi} \tag{49}$$

where $k = (2\pi\hbar)^{n/2}\widehat{\Psi}(p_0)$; formula (49) thus allows to determine $\Psi(x)$ by scanning through the values of x. Thus, by reducing the disturbance induced by measuring the position and thereafter performing a sharp measurement of momentum we can reconstruct the wavefunction pointwise. In [36] Lundeen and Bamber generalize this construction to mixed states and arbitrary pairs of observables. Using the complex distribution $\rho_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,p)$ defined above it is easy to recover the formula (49) of Lundeen *et al.* In fact, choose $a(x,p) = \Pi_{x_0}(x,p) = \delta(x-x_0)$; its Weyl quantization

$$\widehat{\Pi_{x_0}}\Psi(x) = \Psi(x_0)\delta(x-x_0)$$

is the projection operator: $\widehat{\Pi}_{x_0}|\Psi\rangle = \Psi(x_0)|x_0\rangle$. Using the elementary properties of the Dirac delta function together with the marginal property (25), formula (28) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Pi_{x_0}\rangle_{\Phi,\Psi} &= \int \delta(x-x_0)\rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x,p)d^np\,d^nx \\ &= \int \rho_{\Phi,\Psi}(x_0,p)d^np \\ &= \frac{\Phi^*(x_0)\Psi(x_0)}{\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle}\end{aligned}$$

which is (48); formula (49) follows.

3.2 Reconstruction: the WWM approach

It is well-known [18, 19] that the knowledge of the Wigner distribution W_Ψ uniquely determines the state $|\Psi\rangle$; this is easily seen by noting that W_Ψ is essentially a Fourier transform and applying the Fourier inversion formula, which yields

$$\Psi(x)\Psi^*(x') = \int e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}p(x-x')}W_\Psi(\tfrac{1}{2}(x+x'),p)d^np; \tag{50}$$

one then chooses x' such that $\Psi(x') \neq 0$, which yields the value of $\Psi(x)$ for arbitrary x. The same procedure applies to the cross-Wigner transform (10); one finds that

$$\Psi(x)\Phi^*(x') = \int e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}p(x-x')}W_{\Psi,\Phi}(\tfrac{1}{2}(x+x'),p)d^np. \tag{51}$$

Notice that if we choose $x' = x$ we recover the generalized marginal condition (15) satisfied by the cross-Wigner distribution.

Thus, the knowledge of $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ and Φ is in principle sufficient to determine the wavefunction Ψ. Here is a stronger statement which shows that the state $|\Psi\rangle$ can be reconstructed from $W_{\Psi,\Phi}$ using an *arbitrary* auxiliary state $|\Lambda\rangle$ non-orthogonal to $|\Phi\rangle$:

Proposition 2 *Let Λ be an arbitrary vector in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle \neq 0$. We have*

$$\Psi(x) = \frac{2^n}{\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle}\iint W_{\Psi,\Phi}(y,p)\widehat{T}_{GR}(y,p)\Lambda(x)d^npd^ny; \tag{52}$$

equivalently,

$$\Psi(x) = 2^n\frac{\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle}{\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle}\iint \rho_{\Psi,\Phi}(y,p)\widehat{T}_{GR}(y,p)\Lambda(x)d^npd^ny. \tag{53}$$

Proof. By a standard continuity and density argument it is sufficient to assume that Ψ, Φ, Λ are in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Using the equality (51) we have

$$\Psi(x)\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle = \iint e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}p(x-x')}W_{\Psi,\Phi}(\tfrac{1}{2}(x+x'),p)\Lambda(x')d^npd^nx'.$$

Setting $y = \frac{1}{2}(x+x')$ we get

$$\Psi(x)\langle\Phi|\Lambda\rangle = 2^n\iint e^{\frac{2i}{\hbar}p(x-y)}W_{\Psi,\Phi}(y,p)\Lambda(2y-x)d^npd^ny$$

which yields (52) in view of the explicit formula (33) for the Grossmann–Royer parity operator. ■

4 Discussion and Perspectives

We have been able to give a complete characterization of the notion of weak value in terms of the Wigner distribution, which is intimately related to the Weyl quantization scheme through Moyal's formula (7). There are however other possible physically meaningful quantization schemes; the most interesting is certainly that of Born–Jordan [9, 10], which plays an increasingly important role in quantum mechanics and in time-frequency analysis [7, 8, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24], and each of these leads to a different phase space formalism, where the Wigner distribution has to be replaced by more general element of the "Cohen class" [11, 12]. Unexpected difficulties however arise, especially when one deals with the reconstruction problem; these difficulties have a purely mathematical origin, and are related to the division of

distributions (for a mathematical analysis of the nature of these difficulties, see [13]). The reconstruction problem for general phase space distributions will be addressed in a forthcoming publication.

Acknowledgement 3 *The second author has been funded by the grant P-27773 of the Austrian Research Agency FWF.*

References

[1] Y. Aharonov, P. G. Bergmann, and J. Lebowitz, Time Symmetry in the Quantum Process of Measurement. Phys. Rev. B **134**, B1410–B1416 (1964).

[2] Y. Aharonov, and L. Vaidman, Properties of a quantum system during the time interval between two measurements. Phys. Rev. A **41**(1), 11–20 (1990).

[3] Y. Aharonov, and L. Vaidman, Complete description of a quantum system at a given time, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **24**, 2315–2328 (1991).

[4] Y. Aharonov, and L. Vaidman, The Two-State Vector Formalism: An Updated Review. Lect. Notes. Phys. **734**, 399–447 (2008).

[5] L. M. Artiles, and R. D. Gill, An invitation to quantum tomography, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) **67**(1) 109–134 (2005).

[6] M. Asorey, A. Ibort, G. Marmo, and F. Ventriglia, Quantum Tomography twenty years later. Physica Scripta, **90**(7), 074031 (2015).

[7] P. Boggiatto, G. De Donno,and A. Oliaro, Time-Frequency Representations of Wigner Type and Pseudo-Differential Operators, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **362**(9) 4955–4981 (2010).

[8] P. Boggiatto, Bui Kien Cuong, G. De Donno, and A. Oliaro, Weighted integrals of Wigner representations, J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl. **1**(4) 401–415 (2010).

[9] M. Born, and P. Jordan, Zur Quantenmechanik, Zeits,. Physik **34**, 858–888 (1925).

[10] M. Born, W. Heisenberg, and P. Jordan, Zur Quantenmechanik II, Z. Physik **35**, 557–615 (1925).

[11] L. Cohen, Generalized phase-space distribution functions. J. Math. Phys. **7**, 781–786 (1966).

[12] L. Cohen, Can Quantum Mechanics Be Formulated as a Classical Probability Theory? Philosophy of Science **33**(4), 317–322 (1966).

[13] E. Cordero, M. de Gosson, and F. Nicola, On the Invertibility of Born–Jordan Quantization, Preprint 2015, arXiv:1507.00144 [math.FA] (2015).

[14] J. P. Dahl, and M. Springborg, Wigner's phase space function and atomic structure: I. The hydrogen atom ground state. Molecular Physics **47**(5) 1001–1019 (1982).

[15] T. J. Dunn, I. A. Walmsley, and S. Mukamel, Experimental determination of the quantum-mechanical state of a molecular vibrational mode using fluorescence tomography. Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**(6), 884 (1995).

[16] M. R. Feyereisen, How the Weak Variance of Momentum Can Turn Out to be Negative, Found. Phys. **45**, 535–556 (2015).

[17] J. Fischbach, and M. Freyberger, Quantum optical reconstruction scheme using weak values, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052110 (2012).

[18] G. B. Folland, *Harmonic Analysis in Phase space*, Annals of Mathematics studies, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1989.

[19] M. de Gosson, *Symplectic Methods in Harmonic Analysis and in Mathematical Physics*, Birkhäuser, 2011.

[20] M. de Gosson, Born–Jordan Quantization and the Equivalence of the Schrödinger and Heisenberg Pictures. Found. Phys. **44**(10), 1096–1106 (2014)

[21] M. de Gosson, *Born–Jordan Quantization*: *Theory and Applications*, Springer, 2016.

[22] M. de Gosson, and L. D. Abreu, Weak values and Born–Jordan quantization. Quantum Theory: Reconsiderations of Foundations 6, vol. **1508**. (2012) 156–161.

[23] M. de Gosson, and S. de Gosson, The reconstruction problem and weak quantum values. J. Phys. A: Mathematical and Theoretical **45**(11) 115305 (2012).

[24] M. de Gosson, and S. de Gosson, Weak values of a quantum observable and the cross-Wigner distribution. Phys. Lett. A **376**(4) 293–296.(2012).

[25] A. Grossmann, Parity operators and quantization of δ-functions, Commun. Math. Phys., **48** 191–193 (1976).

[26] Hai-Woong Lee, Theory and application of the quantum phase-space distribution functions, Phys. Reps. **259**(3) 147–211(1995).

[27] M. Hillery, R. F. O'Connell, M. O. Scully, and E. P. Wigner, Distribution functions in physics: fundamentals, Phys. Reps. (Review Section of Physics Letters) **106**(3), 121–167 (1984).

[28] F. Hlawatsch, and P. Flandrin, The interference structure of the Wigner distribution and related time-frequency signal representations. The Wigner Distribution, Theory and Applications in Signal Processing, W.Mecklenbräuker and F. Hlawatsch, Eds. Elsevier **59**–133 (1997).

[29] K. Husimi, and Kôdi, Some formal properties of the density matrix. Proc. Phys. Math. Soc. Jpn. **22**(4) 264–314 (1940).

[30] J. J. Itatani, J. Levesque, D. Zeidler, Hiromichi Niikura, H. Pépin, J. C. Kieffer, P. B. Corkum, and D. M. Villeneuve, Tomographic imaging of molecular orbitals. Nature **432**(7019), 867–871 (2004).

[31] U. Leonhardt, Measuring the Quantum State of Light, Cambridge Studies in Modern Optics pp. 204, Cambridge University Press (1997).

[32] U. Leonhardt, and H. Paul, Measuring the Quantum State of Light, Prog. Quant. Electr. **19**, 89–130 (1995).

[33] R. G. Littlejohn, The semiclassical evolution of wave packets, Phys. Rep. **138**, 4-5 193–291 (1986).

[34] A. C. Lobo, and C. A. Ribeiro, Weak values and the quantum phase space, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012112, (2009).

[35] J. S. Lundeen, B. Sutherland, A. Patel, C. Stewart, and C. C. Bamber, Direct measurement of the quantum wavefunction. Nature, **474**(7350), (2011) 188–191.

[36] J. S. Lundeen, and C. C. Bamber, Procedure for Direct Measurement of General Quantum States Using Weak Measurements, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 070402 (2012).

[37] J. S. Lundeen, A. Feito, H. Coldenstrodt-Ronge, K. L. Pregnell, Ch. Silberhorn, T. C. Ralph, J. Eisert, M. B. Plenio, and I. A. Walmsley, Tomography of quantum detectors, Nature Physics **5**, 27–30 (2009).

[38] L. G. Lutterbach, and L. Davidovich, Method for Direct Measurement of the Wigner Function in Cavity QED and Ion Traps, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**(13), 2547–50 (1997).

[39] A. I. Lvovsky,and M. G. Raymer, Continuous-variable optical quantum-state tomography, Reviews of Modern Physics **81**(1), 299 (2009).

[40] N. H. McCoy, On the function in quantum mechanics which corresponds to a given function in classical mechanics, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **18**(11), 674–676 (1932).

[41] J. E. Moyal, Quantum mechanics as a statistical theory, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **45**, 99 (1949).

[42] L. Pauling, General Chemistry, 3rd ed., p. 125, W.H. Freeman & Co., (1970).

[43] M. G. Raymer, Measuring the quantum mechanical wave function, Contemporary Physics **38**(5), 343–355 (1997).

[44] A. S. Roy, and S. M. Roy, Optimum phase space probabilities from quantum tomography, Journal of Mathematical Physics, **55**(1), 012102 (2014).

[45] A. Royer, Wigner functions as the expectation value of a parity operator, Phys. Rev. A **15** 449–450 (1977).

[46] J. R. Shewell, On the Formation of Quantum-Mechanical Operators. Am. J. Phys. **27** 16–21 (1959).

[47] R. Silva, Y. Guryanova, N. Brunner, N. Linden, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, Pre-and postselected quantum states: Density matrices, tomography, and Kraus operators. Phys. Rev. A, **89**(1), 012121 (2014).

[48] D. T. Smithey, D. T., M. Beck, M. G Raymer, and A. Faridani, Measurement of the Wigner distribution and the density matrix of a light mode using optical homodyne tomography: Application to squeezed states and the vacuum. Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**(9) 1244 (1993).

[49] E. P. Wigner, On the quantum correction for thermodynamic equilibrium, Phys. Rev. **40**, 749–759 (1932).

[50] H. H. Szu, and J. A. Blodgett, Wigner distribution and ambiguity function, Optics in Four Dimensions-1980. Vol. **65**. No. 1. AIP Publishing, 1980.

[51] Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geometric_quantization

[52] P. M. Woodward, *Probability and Information Theory, with Applications to Radar*: International Series of Monographs on Electronics and Instrumentation. Elsevier, 2014.

[53] W. H. Zurek, Sub-Planck structure in phase space and its relevance for quantum decoherence. Nature **412**(6848) 712–717 (2001).